



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/085,415	02/26/2002	Melvin L. Black	MBLKP003	3211
22434	7590	10/01/2003		
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP				
P.O. BOX 778				
BERKELEY, CA 94704-0778				
			EXAMINER	
			SORKIN, DAVID L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1723	

DATE MAILED: 10/01/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/085,415

Applicant(s)

BLACK, MELVIN L.

Examiner

David L. Sorkin

Art Unit

1723

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 July 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9-20 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 2 and 5-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3 and 4 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 01 July 2000 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 07/22/02.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-8, drawn to an agitation device, classified in class 366, subclass 64.
 - II. Claims 9-13, drawn to a method of recycling concrete including separating aggregates, classified in class 210, subclass 767.
 - III. Claims 14-20, drawn to methods controlling a motor control for agitating cement slurry, classified in class 366, subclass 2.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

2. Inventions I and II are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP § 806.05(e)). In this case the apparatus to agitate slurry without the removing of aggregates required by the method. Also, the apparatus could be used for purposes other than "recycling concrete", for example to agitate virgin concrete, or to agitate, food, paint, asphalt, polymers or other materials.

3. Inventions I and III are related as process and apparatus for its practice. The inventions are distinct if it can be shown that either: (1) the process as claimed can be practiced by another materially different apparatus or by hand, or (2) the apparatus as claimed can be used to practice another and materially different process. (MPEP §

Art Unit: 1723

806.05(e)). In this case the apparatus could be used without the monitoring load or density steps required by the methods. The motor could be controlled irrespective of these variables. Also, the apparatus could be used for purposes other than agitating cement slurry, for example to agitate cement solids, or to agitate, food, paint, asphalt, polymers or other materials.

4. Inventions II and III are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because the combination does not require the monitoring required by the subcombination. The subcombination has separate utility such as mixing cement without removing the aggregates.

5. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

6. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for each Group is different, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

7. During a telephone conversation with C. Douglass Thomas on 25 September 2003 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of Group I, claims 1-8. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this

Art Unit: 1723

Office action. Claims 9-20 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Drawings

8. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the "plurality of paddles" must be shown or the feature canceled from the claims. No new matter should be entered.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

10. Claim 1, 2 and 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Noda et al. (US 6,341,889). Regarding claim 1, Noda ('889) discloses a machine comprising a vessel (T) having an agitation device (3,73); a motor (SM) that drives the agitation device and a control system (TM,SS) that controls frequency with which said

motor drives the agitation device (see col. 17, lines 30-38). While the reference does not disclose the material (concrete slurry) intended to be used with the claimed apparatus, "[e]xpressions relating the apparatus to contents thereof during an intended operation are of no significance in determining patentability of the apparatus claim" *Ex parte Thilbault*, 164 USPQ 666, 667 (Bd. App. 1969). Regarding claim 2, said control system monitors a load on said motor during said driving of the agitation device, wherein said control system controls frequency with which said motor drives the agitation device based on load (see col. 17, lines 30-38). Regarding claim 5, the agitation device is a rotatable agitation device (see col. 5, lines 1-3). Regarding claim 6, the rotatable agitation device comprises a shaft with a plurality of paddles (see Fig. 16a). It is considered that claims 7 and 8 fail to further limit the claimed machine because they are directed toward intended operations (not the capability of the controller as in other claims). "[T]he manner or method in which such machine is to be utilized is not germane to the issue of patentability of the machine itself" *In re Casey* 152 USPQ 235 (CCPA 1967). Nonetheless, regarding claim 7, frequency with which said motor drives the agitation device is selected from predetermined values based on the load (see col. 4, lines 21-26) and, regarding claim 8, the predetermined values are stored in a look-up table (see col. 4, lines 21-26).

11. Claims 1, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lande (US 5,829,344). Regarding claim 1, Lande ('344) discloses a machine comprising a vessel (12 and/or 34) having an agitation device (50,86); a motor (64,66) that drives the agitation device and a control system (61) that controls duration with

Art Unit: 1723

which said motor drives the agitation device (see col. 2, lines 44-49). While the reference does not disclose the material (concrete slurry) intended to be used with the claimed apparatus, "[e]xpressions relating the apparatus to contents thereof during an intended operation are of no significance in determining patentability of the apparatus claim" *Ex parte Thilbault*, supra. It is considered that claims 7 and 8 fail to further limit the claimed machine because they are directed toward intended operations (not the capability of the controller as in other claims). "[T]he manner or method in which such machine is to be utilized is not germane to the issue of patentability of the machine itself" *In re Casey* supra.

Allowable Subject Matter

12. Claims 3 and 4 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The closest prior art reference is Noda et al. (US 6,341,889); however, Noda ('889) discloses a controller which decreases frequency in response to increased load, the opposite of what is claimed in claim 4. Noda ('889) also does not disclose a controller which increases duration in response to increased load.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 1723

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David L. Sorkin whose telephone number is 703-308-1121. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 -5:30 Mon.-Fri..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wanda L. Walker can be reached on 703-308-0457. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-0661.



David Sorkin



CHARLES E. COOLEY
PRIMARY EXAMINER